



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

90
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/749,159	12/27/2000	Thomas John Eggebraaten	ROC920000230US1	4947
46296	7590	10/19/2005	EXAMINER	
MARTIN & ASSOCIATES, LLC IBM INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW DEPARTMENT DEPARTMENT 917, BUILDING 006-1 3605 HIGHWAY 52 NORTH ROCHESTER, MN 55901-7829			HO, THOMAS M	
		ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER
		2134		
DATE MAILED: 10/19/2005				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/749,159	EGGEBRAATEN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Thomas M. Ho	2134	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 March 2005.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) 1-3 is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 4-12 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-12 are pending.
2. Claims 1-3 are allowable.

Reasons for Allowance

3. In light of the interview of 10/13/05, the Examiner has allowed independent claim 1, and its depending claims 2 and 3.

Previously, the Examiner argued the position that in any directory, such as a folder, there are entries that may be interpreted as proxy entries, in that these entries refer to a particular resource or file. It is understood by those of ordinary skill in the art that technically, a directory is merely a logical association, and that it is incapable of physical storage. For this reason, the Examiner has argued that any directory with items or files within it necessarily contains “proxy” entries---entries that refer to a particular file by means of logical association as understood by the operating system or the file service.

During the interview of 10/13/05, Applicant’s representative clarified the distinction in claim 1 in which it is not the operating system or file system, but the application itself which “includes the logical mapping correlating each protected resource” with a corresponding proxy entry.

Applicant's representative has clarified the distinction made with regards to the arguments on page 8, last paragraph.

The Examiner has found the arguments to be persuasive, accordingly, claim 1 is allowable.

Response to Arguments

4. The Examiner notes however, that the limitation that recites "...the application including a logical mapping that correlates each protected resource..." is not recited in the other independent claims. Independent claims 4, 6, and 8 recite that a logical mapping is "used" however does not explicitly recite that it is included within the application. It is believed that the addition of this element will render the other independent claims allowable.

The crux of Applicant's arguments appear to be directed towards claim 1.

In reference to claim 4:

The cited document does not teach or even suggest making a proxy in the directory for outside resources. The Examiner however, contends that the recitation of an "external protected resource" may be understood in the art to refer to a reference located on another part of the network. In this sense, the resource is "external".

In reference to the arguments of claim 6, the Examiner notes that from the interpretation of proxy entry as argued by the Examiner, each entry within the directory may be considered a proxy entry. Furthermore, the Applicant again recites the term “external protected resource”. However, the Examiner notes that this term may be understood in the art to refer to a reference located on another part of the network.

Claim 8 appears to be repetition of the arguments presented for claims 4 and 6.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 4-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by “Understanding LDAP” by the International Technical Support Organization.

In reference to claim 4:

“Understanding LDAP” (Page 7, Section 1.1.4, Directory Security) - (Page 8, paragraph 1) discloses a method for a directory service that contains a proxy entry corresponding to an external protected resource to provide authentication and authorization functions to a software application, where the directory service is LDAP which contains proxy entries corresponding to

file resources which correspond to respective ACLs which, with the LDAP server software allow for authentication and authorization functions, the method comprising the steps of:

- When the software application needs to access the external protected resource, performing the steps of:
 - Identifying a proxy entry that corresponds to the external protected resource, where the objects are listed as LDAP entries such as that shown in (Page 18, Figure 5)
 - The software application requesting from the directory service access to the proxy entry that corresponds to the external protected resource, where the application is the client software necessary to allow the user to browse LDAP directories such as that listed on (Page 18, Figure 5)
 - If the directory service grants access to the proxy entry that corresponds to the external protected resource, the application accesses the external protected resource, where the entries requested are then accessed if permission is granted.

(Page 4, Section 1.1.2 “Directory Clients and Servers”)

In reference to claim 5:

“Understanding LDAP” (Page 7, Section 1.1.4, Directory Security) - (Page 8, paragraph 1)

discloses the method of claim 4 further comprising the steps of:

If the directory service denies access to the proxy entry that corresponds to the external protected resource, the application does not access the protected resource, where the resource cannot be accessed if the access right for that object in the directory is not granted.

In reference to claim 6:

“Understanding LDAP” (Page 7, Section 1.1.4, Directory Security) - (Page 8, paragraph 1) discloses a method for a directory service to provide authentication and authorization functions to a software application, the method comprising steps of:

- Determining which of a plurality of resources require protection, where determining which of a plurality of resources requires protection is determined by attaching an ACL to each object. An object without an ACL for example, could be assumed to be accessible to anyone.
- Creating a proxy entry in the directory service for each protected resource, where the proxy entry is a representation on the interface of the client software, of a resource on the server or a distributed system accessible by the server. (Page 18, Figure 5)
- Generating a logical mapping that correlates each protected resource to its corresponding proxy entry, where a mapping is logically generated on the client interface in which the resource is not on the client system itself, but another system. (Page 18, Figure 5)
- When the software application needs to access a selected protected resource, performing the steps of:
 - Using the logical mapping to identify a proxy entry that corresponds to the selected protected resource, where the logical mapping is from the directory entries on the client side to the resources on the server. (Page 6-7, Section 1.1.3 “Distributed Directories”)

- The software application requesting from the directory service access to the identified proxy entry, where the software is both the LDAP client and server.
- If the directory service grants access to the identified proxy entry, the application accesses the selected protected resource, where the LDAP server must verify the user against the details in the ACL for the resource before granting access. (Page 7, Section 1.1.4, Directory Security) - (Page 8, paragraph 1)

In reference to claim 7:

“Understanding LDAP” (Page 7, Section 1.1.4, Directory Security) - (Page 8, paragraph 1)

discloses the method of claim 6 further comprising the step of:

If the directory service denies access to the proxy entry that corresponds to the selected protected resource, the application does not access the selected protected resource, where the resource cannot be accessed if the access right for that object in the directory is not granted

In reference to claim 8:

“Understanding LDAP” (Page 5, Figure 1) & (Page 18, Figure 5) discloses the program product comprising:

- A software application that uses a logical mapping that correlates a plurality of protected resources that are not stored or contained within the directory with corresponding proxy entries in a directory service that is managed by a directory service server(LDAP server), the application determining whether the application is authorized to access a selected protected resource by invoking authentication and authorization functions in the directory

service server to determine whether the proxy entry corresponding to the selected resource may be accessed, and if so, the application accesses the selected protected resource, (Authentication and Authorization pages 66-69) where a resource is logically mapped from the proxy in the client side representation of the server side resource, and is only accessed if a user is authenticated and authorized according to the permissions to the resource given in its ACL. (Page 7, Section 1.1.4 Directory Security, paragraph 3) – (Page 8, 1st paragraph)

- Computer-readable signal bearing media bearing the software application, where the signal bearing media bearing the software application is contained in the memory of the client and server, as well the hard drives, and the possible transmission media in the communications between the client and the server.

In reference to claim 9:

“Understanding LDAP” discloses the program product of claim 8 wherein the signal bearing media comprises recordable media, where it is understood that signal bearing media may comprise recordable media such as hard disk drives, CD-R, floppy disks, or other magnetic media, all necessary in bearing the data signals when the data is accessed from the media.

In reference to claim 10:

Art Unit: 2134

“Understanding LDAP” discloses the program product of claim 8 wherein the signal bearing media comprises transmission media, where it is understood that in order for data to be transmitted from the client to the server, that some transmission media is needed and used.

In reference to claim 11:

“Understanding LDAP” discloses the program product of claim 8 wherein the directory service server is a Lightweight Directory Access Protocol (LDAP) server, and wherein the directory is an LDAP directory.

In reference to claim 12:

“Understanding LDAP” discloses the program product of claim 8 wherein the application does not access the selected protected resource if the proxy entry corresponding to the selected resource cannot be accessed.

(Page 7, Section 1.1.4 Directory Security, paragraph 3) – (Page 8, 1st paragraph)

Conclusion

6. The following art not relied upon is made of record:

- US patent 6463470, paragraphs 32-33 of the detailed description, discloses a method in which the LDAP server employs an application in which a logical mapping of access values is “accessible” to the application, but does not disclose that they are apart of the application.

- US patent 6466984, paragraphs 35-36 of the detailed description discloses a method in which the application fetches mapping information stored in the repository but again, does not state that the mapping is included in the application.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication from the examiner should be directed to Thomas M Ho whose telephone number is (571)272-3835. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F from 9:30 AM - 6:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gregory A. Morse can be reached on (571)272-3838.

The Examiner may also be reached through email through Thomas.Ho6@uspto.gov

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (571)272-2100.

General Information/Receptionist Telephone: 571-272-2100 Fax: 571-273-8300

Customer Service Representative Telephone: 571-272-2100 Fax: 571-273-8300

TMH

October 16th, 2005



GREGORY MORSE
SUPERVISORY PATENT
TECHNOLOGY